



City of Seattle
Seattle Department of Neighborhoods
Bernie Matsuno, Director

SWEDISH MEDICAL CENTER CHERRY HILL CAMPUS MAJOR INSTITUTIONS MASTER PLAN CITIZEN'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SWEDISH MEDICAL CENTER CHERRY HILL CAMPUS MAJOR INSTITUTIONS MASTER PLAN CITIZEN'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Committee Members

Katie Porter, Chair

Patrick Carter

Andrew Coates

Dylan Glosecki

Maja Hadlock

Joy Jacobson

Eric J. Oliner

J. Elliot Smith

Laurel Spelman

Mark Tilbe

Jamile Mack

*Swedish Medical
Center Non-
management
Representative*

Nicholas Richter

Committee Alternates

David Letrondo

Ex-officio Members

Steve Sheppard

*Department of
Neighborhoods*

Stephanie Haines

*Department of
Planning and
Development*

Marcia Peterson

*Swedish Medical
Center Management*

Cristina Van Valkenburgh

*Seattle Department of
Transportation*

Meeting Notes

Meeting #9

November 7, 2013

Swedish Medical Center

Swedish Education & Conference Center

550 17th Avenue

First Floor - James Tower

Members and Alternates Present

Katie Porter

Andrew Coates

Laurel Spelman

Patrick Carter

Dylan Glosecki

Maja Hadlock

David Letrondo

Nicholas Richter

Members and Alternates Present

Jamile Mack

Eric Oliner

J. Elliot Smith

Mark Tilbe

Ex-Officio Members Present

Steve Sheppard, DON

Marcia Peterson, SMC

Stephanie Haines, DPD

(See sign-in sheet)

I. Welcome and Introductions

The meeting was opened by Katie Porter. Brief Introductions followed. Steve Sheppard Noted that the purpose of tonight's meeting is to provide an opportunity for the committee to begin its review the preliminary draft documents provided by the DPD, DON, and SDOT, and particularly determine how this review would be conducted. Mr. Sheppard noted that the documents being discussed are preliminary drafts that are made available for Committee comments. He observed that since the Committee has only had access to the documents for a very short time it is unlikely that the actual comments would be developed at this meeting, but that a process for developing those comments should be developed at this meeting. He also noted that the documents are not the formal Draft Plan or Draft EIS. The formal draft documents will be available later. Under the present plan it is likely that those document will be published in late February.

Mr. Sheppard emphasized that the preliminary draft documents are not widely circulated and not subject for public comment; this process occurs during the draft review. While these preliminary documents are not formally distributed, they are being made available at the DON's

website. Mr. Sheppard also noted that members of the public that are interested in making comments on what they see online can be submitted to DON and to the committee via email and any comments received will be part of the public record.

II. Overview of Preliminary Draft Master Plan – John Jex

John Jex, from Callison was recognized to make a presentation about the Preliminary Draft Master Plan. Mr. Jex noted that the first section of the draft master plan contains introductory background information about the Swedish campus. It summarizes program components along with the alternatives that were presented in the past meetings; these alternatives are: 1, 5, 6, and 7. Additional information has been incorporated to these alternatives including: diagrams, development of standard components, landscaping, open space, parking spaces, and transportation, etc. There are several other components of this draft master plan that are currently “works in progress” and have not been completed. This includes the transportation elements.

Mr. Sheppard commented that as this preliminary draft master plan moves forward to the draft, there significantly more information and structure will be provided including: streetscapes, landscaping, setbacks, etc. Mr. Sheppard informed the committee that developing statements and comments to the current preliminary draft document is critical so that the next draft contains all the vital information.

IV. Overview of Preliminary DEIS contents and schedule of comments

Katy Chaney, from URS was recognized to present the Preliminary Draft Environmental Impact Statement (PDEIS). Ms. Chaney mentioned that the draft PDEIS is currently a work in progress and will add new information as we wait for the conclusion of several studies that are currently underway. Ms. Chaney noted that the PDEIS is organized and contains a summary chapter, the alternatives that being considered, existing environmental conditions, anticipated impacts from the alternatives that were introduced, references and a glossary. The document also contains appendices that have worksheets, simulations and transportation reports. This PDEIS is being distributed to get comments from Swedish, Sabey, City of Seattle and members of this committee.

Editor's note: The CAC received the PDEIS copies just prior to the meeting

V. Overview of transportation analysis, approach and findings

Mike Swenson, from the Transpo Group, was introduced to make a presentation concerning the transportation analysis. Mr. Swenson stated that the Transpo Group has more than thirty experience in this field. The firm worked on a variety of design transportation projects such as master plans focusing on multi-modal planning and analysis.

Mr. Swenson noted that the full analysis is not yet included in these preliminary documents. The transportation analysis will provide data and evaluate the impacts on both traffic generation and, transit utilization forward to 2040 and include vehicular, non-motorized impacts, and connectivity to parking, level of service at key intersections (a measure of time delay and congestion), traffic safety and neighborhood connections. Mr. Swenson further noted that the studies will be looking at a seven to eight year build out.

The Transportation analysis is also taking into account increases in traffic associated with projected development in other areas will impact and generate traffic and especially that associated with Seattle University or Virginia Mason. He noted that the choice of study area which intersections and locations to include were made in close consultation with SDOT and DPD. Transpo also will be conducting studies and analysis to get better information regarding the parking utilization. We will also include pedestrian and transit connectivity to be added to our list for improvements as we go through the process.

Mr. Swenson also mentioned that as a future goal, we will be looking at the level of service for TMP for SOV in the studies as well. Currently, it is at a 50% SOV rate.

VI. Public Comments/Questions

Comments from Bob Cooper: Mr. Cooper asked if the alternatives presented at the meeting are the only alternatives in the table? He also asked if the Traffic data and analyses had been included in this scenario?

Response: SMC staff responded that The alternatives included in the Preliminary Draft Plan are the alternatives that are moving forward. These alternatives will be included in the draft EIS. As part of the draft EIS process both the public and various agencies can comment on impacts and alternatives.

Regarding the traffic planning, the response was that it couldn't be answered at this time.

Comment from Murray Anderson: Mr. Anderson stated that he was concerned about both parking and traffic flow. He strongly suggested that Swedish consider the possibility of validation of parking for patients so that patient parking would be lower cost so that patients and immediate family members would not have an incentive to park on the nearby streets. I would like for Swedish to look at for the employees to get bus pass as being employees of Swedish.

Response: Swedish subsidize bus passes at 50%.

Comment from Greg Harmon: –Mr. Harmon stated that he lives at 9th and Cherry. He expressed concern about light and glare emanating from parking garages in the broader area. He stated that similar problems might occur with the proposed increased development

Comment: An individual who lives on 16th and Cherry made a comment regarding the options going forward regarding the Preliminary Draft MIMP. He stated that the only compelling logic for the irregular shape of the MIMP boundary is an opportunistic logic since Sabey owns the adjacent properties. He would like to see a very substantial compelling logic, for why the shape of the MIMP should include this that have a potential impact to the neighborhood particularly around traffic and parking.

Comment: An individual made a comment on how important for the CAC members to review the EIS document and think about the environment. He noted that this is not a Swedish's EIS but the City and CAC's EIS. He urged CAC members to review this carefully and make sure it answers questions concerning the environment impacts.

VII. Committee Discussion

Steve Sheppard informed the committee that the next step in the process is to review the document that was presented. Mr. Sheppard suggested that in the past, the committee either reviews the whole document or split the document into sections. Each committee member will then forward their comments to Steve and he will create a matrix that summarizes all the comments from each of the committee members that can be presented to the institution for their response. Mr. Sheppard emphasized that it is very important for the committee to look at the alternative sections carefully; and submit comments as early as possible so that the institution could come back with their response.

The committee decided to split the document into sections and develop specific comments to each section. The committee members will submit their comments to Steve Sheppard. Mr. Sheppard will create a summary document to track these comments with follow up actions for the institution to review and respond.

The next committee meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, December 5th. Mr. Sheppard mentioned that at this meeting, the committee will have the opportunity to discuss and review the comments.

VIII. Adjournment

No further business was presented to the committee. The meeting was adjourned.